

APR 28 1966

CPYRGHT

China will enter its Thermidor stage, and certainly no one knows when that stage will develop if it ever arrives.

Fulbright on China

Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in his Johns Hopkins address has made a scholarly contribution to a better American understanding of the historic developments that lie behind existing Chinese Communist policy.

There is no doubt that the wounds of generations of imperialist injustice lie behind some of the bitterness in Peking's irrational anti-American attitudes. But if there is merit in acknowledging this justification, there is no merit in standing history on its head in an effort to vindicate Communist policy. It is simply rubbish to say, as the Senator does, that the Communists "won patriotic support by actively fighting the Japanese while the Kuomintang remained passive, waiting for the Americans to overwhelm Japan."

If the Senator had thoroughly read Dr. Fairbank from whom he otherwise quotes liberally, he would have read that:

The Chinese Communists' comparatively successful wartime expansion was accomplished without the oppressive burden of frontal resistance and national responsibilities that exhausted Chungking's energies. National Government forces tied down most of Japan's troops in China, roughly half her armies overseas, and suffered the great part of China's three million or more battle casualties. Meanwhile the CCP regime built up its power on a more primitive level.

Allowance must be made for the cycle that ordinarily moderates a revolutionary movement. Communist China may repeat the Soviet evolution. But it may be unsafe to rely completely on such historical analogy. As Bryce has pointed out, the chief advantage of studying history is that it rescues one from the dangers of false historical analogy. No one knows for sure that Communist

The Senator's belief that the Communist Chinese are conservative in action and reckless in utterance will not altogether stand scrutiny. The government of Tibet was not driven into exile by a barrage of adjectives. The Indian soldiers who were killed in Ladakh and all along the Himalayas from there to Assam and the Northeastern Frontier were not just the victims of a literary exercise. The fierce assault upon Quemoy and Matsu was a lot more than a mere verbal endeavor.

Senator Fulbright thinks that China is presumed to be aggressive merely because of what its leaders say. But that presumption does not rest alone on alarming words. Even a leader so disposed to allow for Chinese Communist error as the late Prime Minister Nehru in 1959, before the Chinese invasion of India, acknowledged an expansionist tendency in China. He said:

Ever since the Chinese Revolution, we naturally had to think of what the new China was likely to be. We realized that this revolution was going to be a very big factor in Asia, in the world and in regard to us. We realized—we knew that amount of history—that a strong China is normally an expansionist China. Throughout history that has been the case . . . As the years have gone by, this fact has become more and more apparent and obvious.

It is right to hope that China will one day enter that phase of its revolution when it will be able to moderate its aggressive impulses. It is correct to extend to Communist China such evidences of our wish for friendship and cooperation as we can tender without jeopardy to our own national survival. But it would be wrong to allow these hopes to persuade us to dismantle the defenses of this country or to permit them to induce us to withdraw support from the small independent neighbors of Communist China.

CPYRGHT